



December 17, 1999

Lieutenant Brad Lancaster
Amarillo Police Department
200 East 3rd
Amarillo, Texas 79101-1514

OR99-3666

Dear Lieutenant Lancaster:

You have asked whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act, chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 130366.

The Amarillo Police Department (the “department”) received a request for any and all criminal records of a named individual. You contend the requested records are excepted from required public disclosure by section 552.101 of the Government Code. We have reviewed the submitted information and considered the exception you claim.

Section 552.101 of the Government Code protects “information considered to be confidential by law, either constitutional, statutory, or by judicial decision,” including information protected by the common-law right of privacy. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668, 683-85 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). This section encompasses other federal statutes and case law.

To the extent the requestor is asking for any unspecified records in which the named individual is identified as a “suspect,” the requestor, in essence, is asking that the city compile that individual’s criminal history. Where an individual’s criminal history information has been compiled by a governmental entity, the information takes on a character that implicates the individual’s right to privacy. *See United States Dep’t of Justice v. Reporters Comm. for Freedom of the Press*, 489 U.S. 749 (1989) (concluding that federal

regulations which limit access to criminal history record information that states obtain from the federal government or other states recognize privacy interest in such information). Similarly, open records decisions issued by this office acknowledge this privacy interest. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 616 (1993), 565 (1990). The department, therefore, must withhold all compilations of the referenced individual's criminal history pursuant to section 552.101.

You also submit a report in which the named individual is the reportee in an incident. Section 552.101 also encompasses both common-law and constitutional privacy. Common-law privacy excepts from disclosure private facts about an individual. *Industrial Found. v. Texas Indus. Accident Bd.*, 540 S.W.2d 668 (Tex. 1976), *cert. denied*, 430 U.S. 931 (1977). Therefore, information may be withheld from the public when (1) it is highly intimate and embarrassing such that its release would be highly objectionable to a person of ordinary sensibilities, and (2) there is no legitimate public interest in its disclosure. *Id.* at 685; Open Records Decision No. 611 at 1 (1992).

The constitutional right to privacy protects two interests. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)). The first is the interest in independence in making certain important decisions related to the "zones of privacy" recognized by the United States Supreme Court. Open Records Decision No. 600 at 4 (1992). The zones of privacy recognized by the United States Supreme Court are matters pertaining to marriage, procreation, contraception, family relationships, child rearing and education. *See id.*

The second interest is the interest in avoiding disclosure of personal matters. The test for whether information may be publicly disclosed without violating constitutional privacy rights involves a balancing of the individual's privacy interests against the public's need to know information of public concern. *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5-7 (1987) (citing *Fadjo v. Coon*, 633 F.2d 1172, 1176 (5th Cir. 1981)). The scope of information considered private under the constitutional doctrine is far narrower than that under the common law; the material must concern the "most intimate aspects of human affairs." *See* Open Records Decision No. 455 at 5 (1987) (citing *Ramie v. City of Hedwig Village*, 765 F.2d 490, 492 (5th Cir. 1985), *cert. denied*, 474 U.S. 1062 (1986)).

This office has found that the following types of information are excepted from required public disclosure under constitutional or common-law privacy: some kinds of medical information or information indicating disabilities or specific illnesses, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 470 (1987) (illness from severe emotional and job-related stress), 455 (1987) (prescription drugs, illnesses, operations, and physical handicaps), 533 (1989) (attempted suicide), personal financial information not relating to the financial transaction between an individual and a governmental body, *see* Open Records Decision Nos. 600 (1992), 545

(1990), 396 (1983) (financial records of inmates), and information concerning the intimate relations between individuals and their family members, *see* Open Records Decision No. 470 (1987). *See also* Health and Safety Code § 81.103 (making certain test result information confidential); Open Records Decision No. 339 (1982) (sexual assault victim has common-law privacy interest which prevents disclosure of information that would identify them). After review of the additional report you have submitted, we conclude that it must be withheld in its entirety pursuant to section 552.101 by a right of privacy.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.


This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at 877/673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rose-Michel Munguía", is written over the printed name.

Rose-Michel Munguía
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

Ref.: 130366

Encl.: Submitted documents

cc: Ms. Rhonda J. Brashears
Underwood, Wilson, Berry, Stein & Johnson, P.C.
P. O. Box 9158
Amarillo, Texas 79405-9158